DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 027 RC 006 258

AUTHOR Dodge, Marjorie T.
TITLE A Survey of Navajo Community School Board Members Including Their Legal Status and Election or Appointment to Federally Operated Schools on the Navajo Indian Reservation.
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 102p.; Educational Specialist thesis submitted to New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Boarding Schools; *Boards of Education; *Economic Status; Employment Level; School Involvement; *Social Characteristics; *Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Navajos

ABSTRACT

After surveying the historical background and the development of Navajo education, the study investigates the socioeconomic characteristics, the educational status, the length of service, and the selection of Navajo Community School Board (NCSB) members for the federally operated schools on the Navajo Reservation. A 22 item questionnaire, designed to elicit responses concerning the composition and functions of NCSB, was sent to 320 NCSB members representing 44 boarding schools, 10 day schools, 4 dormitories, and 2 Navajo-contracted schools. Questionnaires were completed and returned by 192 subjects. The findings, based on these responses, are presented, and are used in making comparisons between NCSB members and members of general public school boards. Conclusions state that NCSB members represent Navajo interests rather than national politics, that the Navajo tribe is actively involved in community schools, and that the tribe is seeking operational control of their own affairs. Recommendations are that the NCSB Manual be revised, that the NCSB be given decision-making power, and that the training of NCSB be stepped up. Fourteen tables and 2 appendixes are included. (FF)

ED 064027

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A SURVEY OF NAVAJO COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS INCLUDING THEIR LEGAL STATUS AND ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT TO FEDERALLY OPERATED SCHOOLS ON THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

BY

MARJORIE T. DODGE, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis submitted to the Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree
Specialist in Education

Major Subject: Educational Administration

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico
June 1972

RC006258

"A Survey of Navajo Community School Board Members Including Their Legal Status and Election or Appointment to Federally Operated Schools on the Navajo Indian Reservation," a thesis prepared by Marjorie T. Dodge in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, has been approved and accepted by the following:

Dean of the Graduate School

Chairman of the Examining Committee

Date

Committee in charge:

Dr. Jose A. Perea, Chairman

Dr. Timothy J. Pettibone

Dr. Darrell F. Kirby

Dr. Volney W. Howard, Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is grateful to Dr. Jose A. Perea, Chairman of the Supervisory Committee and EPDA Director, for his patient guidance, encouragement, and invaluable advice throughout the design and course of this study. The writer also wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Timothy J. Pettibone, Associate Professor and Department Head, Educational Administration Department, who offered his instruction and assistance as a member of her Advisory Committee; and to Joseph D. Baca, Graduate Assistant, for his encouragement.

The writer would also like to express her sincere appreciation to all Navajo Community School Board members, the Navajo Tribe, the Reservation-based Bureau of Indian Affairs School Administrators, and especially the Principals, for their interest, and support and the cooperation required to complete this study.

Special acknowledgement is due my husband, Paul A. Dodge, for his inspiration and encouragement necessary for the completion of this manuscript.

And last but not least, special thanks are also given to Mrs. Marian E. Baker, whose guidance and direction in preparing the final form were of incalculable value.

VITA

Marjorie T. Dodge was born and reared on the Navajo Reservation at Crownpoint, New Mexico, the daughter of John and Nellie Lewis Tso. She attended school at Crownpoint Elementary and was graduated from Fort Sill Indian High School, Lawton, Oklahoma, in May, 1960.

She received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education from Western New Mexico University, Silver City, in 1964.

For five years she was a classroom teacher at Crystal Boarding School, Navajo, New Mexico, and two years at Chuska/ Tohatchi Boarding Schools as a student teacher supervisor for the Northern Arizona University's Fourth Cycle Teacher Corps Program on the Navajo Reservation.

In the summer of 1971, she enrolled at New Mexico State University under the fellowship program of the Education Professions Development Act (E.P.D.A.) to pursue the Specialist in Education degree in Educational Administration.

PROFESSIONAL AND HONORARY SOCIETIES

Dine Be Olta Association (Navajo Education Association)

PUBLICATIONS

Dodge, Marjorie T., "Should Values Be Taught in the Classroom?" Journal of American Indian Education. Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 15-17, January, 1972.

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF NAVAJO COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
INCLUDING THEIR LEGAL STATUS AND FLECTION OR
APPOINTMENT TO FEDERALLY OPERATED SCHOOLS
ON THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

BY

MARJORIE T. DODGE, B.A., M.A.

Specialist in Education in Educational Administration

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico, 1972

Dr. Jose A. Perea, Chairman

The purpose of this study was to investigate the socio-economic characteristics of the Navajo Community School Board (NCSB) members for the federally operated schools on the Navajo Reservation.

Subjects for the study were 320 NCSB members representing 44 federally operated boarding schools, 10 day schools,

4 peripheral dormitories, and 2 Navajo-contracted schools. The method of investigation was a twenty-two item questionnaire designed to elicit responses concerning the composition and functions of NCSB's. Since this was a descriptive survey, the data were tabulated and categorized for each of the five agencies in the Navajo Area and for the sample as a whole. Of the 320 members, 192 returned completed questionnaires, thus giving a response rate of 60 percent.

Study results showed 70.3 percent male respondents; 88.5 percent of the board members were married. Most respondents fell into the 50-59 or 40-49 age groups. For state of birth, 51.6 percent named New Mexico; 45.8 percent named Arizona; and 2.6 percent named Utah. Most of the respondents' children had attended or were attending Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. For church preference, 58.3 percent favored Protestant sects, although the Native American Church was favored by 22.3 percent. All respondents spoke Navajo; 71.7 percent spoke English (to some extent); one individual reported speaking Navajo, English, and Zuñi. For education, 39.6 percent reported some elementary schooling; 34.4 percent had had no formal education; 22.4 percent had some high school; and 3.1 percent had some college, while only one person had achieved a college degree.

In respect to occupations, 29.7 percent were self-employed; 29.2 percent were tribal employees; and 26.0 percent of the total were unemployed. Regarding service on school boards, 43.2 percent

had served on school boards for three years or more (about the maximum time possible because the boards were established in late 1968), and 34.9 percent had served one year or less. Most (84.4 percent) board members had been elected by local chapter vote, and most (86.5 percent) had participated in NCBS training sessions.

A brief comparison of NCSB members with general public school board members showed some differences. Not all NCSB members are elected (some are appointed), where public school board members are all elected. Like public school boards, NCSB's are composed chiefly of men, but educational background and occupational status differ. About half of public school board members will have a college background and will represent the professional and business interests within the community, where NCSB members will have little if any formal education and will come chiefly from the self-employed and tribal employee categories of occupations.

Recommendations were made to revise the NCSB manual, give board members some administrative or decision-making power (at present the NCSB's act in an advisory capacity only), and step up the training of NCSB members, especially in basic principles of state and federal governments and the relationship of the Navajo in governmental structure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
VITA	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Need for the Study	7
Specific Objectives	8
Limitations of the Study	8
Definitions of Terms	9
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	12
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
Historical Background of Public Education	13
Early control of public schools	14
Development of local school board systems	15
The Public School Board Today	15
Functions of the school board	16
Composition of school boards	18

Chapter		Page
	Historical Background of Navajo Education . . .	20
	Early twentieth century	22
	Mid-twentieth century to the present	22
	The Navajo Community School Boards	24
	Establishment, aims, and goals of the NCSB . .	25
	Policies governing the NCSB	26
	Functions and duties of the NCSB	27
	Summary	28
3.	METHOD OF INVESTIGATION	29
	The Instrument	29
	Organization of the Navajo School System	32
	Distribution of the Questionnaire	33
	Follow-Up Procedure	34
	Responses	34
	Treatment of the Data	35
4.	PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	37
	Sex of Respondents	37
	Marital Status of Respondents	37
	Age of Respondents	40
	Place of Birth of Respondents	42
	Attendance of Respondents' Children by School Types	44
	Church Preference of Respondents	46
	Language(s) Spoken by Respondents	49

Chapter		Page
	Educational Level of Respondents	49
	Types of Schools Attended by Respondents	53
	Occupations of Respondents	55
	Length of Time Served on the Board by Respondents	57
	Method of Selection of Respondents for School Board	61
	Respondents' Participation in School Board Training	64
5.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	67
	Summary	67
	Purpose	67
	Method of investigation	68
	Results	69
	Conclusions	70
	Recommendations	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY		76
APPENDIX A.	Cover Letter and Questionnaire Used in Study	81
APPENDIX B.	Miscellaneous Correspondence	
	1. Principals	85
	2. Superintendents	86
	3. Follow-Up	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Responses of Navajo Community School Board Members to Questionnaires	36
2.	Sex of Respondents	38
3.	Marital Status of Respondents	39
4.	Age of Respondents	41
5.	Place of Birth of Respondents	43
6.	Attendance of Respondents' Children by School Type	45
7.	Church Preference of Respondents	47
8.	Language(s) Spoken by Respondents	50
9.	Educational Level of Respondents	51
10.	Types of Schools Attended by Respondents	54
11.	Occupations of Respondents	56
12.	Length of Time Served on the Board by Respondents	58
13.	Method of Selection of Respondents for School Board	62
14.	Respondents' Participation in School Board Training	65

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

During the 1960's, when attention was being so strongly focused on the problems of minority groups in the United States, there was growing awareness of American Indians and their plight, and more interest in their present and future needs. Certainly they have suffered as much repression, if not more, in the past as any other minority group.[1] Indian leaders, apparently impressed by the success of radical black reformists, began to struggle against the apathy and resignation with which their ancestors had so often met the demands of the white man. Accordingly, American Indians have become a vocal and even radical minority group,[2] looking to the federal government for relief from their complaints.

All branches of the federal government--executive, legislative, and judicial--are concerned with the Indians, but the closest link is with the executive branch. The President appoints the Secretary of the Interior, within whose department is located the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The President nominates the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and he appoints

---

[1] Reader's Digest Almanac and Yearbook 1969 (Pleasantville, N.Y.: Reader's Digest Association, 1969), p. 150.

[2] Wilcomb E. Washburn, "Indians, American," Americana Annual 1970, p. 355.

members of the Indian Claims Commission, a judicial body organized in 1946, to hear and determine claims by Indian tribes against the government.

The traditional legislative determinants of Indian policy are the Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs. In 1967 the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education drafted a resolution to investigate the educational problems of American Indians. In March of 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent Congress a special message on goals and programs for Indian education.[3] A special Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee began investigation into the nation's alleged failure to provide appropriate educational facilities for American Indians. On November 12, 1969, the subcommittee issued its final report, entitled "Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge." This report made sixty recommendations for improving education available to the nation's 600,000 Indians.[4]

Meanwhile, in 1968 the Indian Constitutional Rights Act extended the traditional protection of the Constitution's Bill of Rights to individuals involved in disputes with tribal governments.[5]

---

[3]Lyndon B. Johnson, The Forgotten American: Message to the Congress on Goals and Programs for the American Indian, March 16, 1968. (ERIC ED 024 500)

[4]Washburn, loc. cit.

[5]Ibid., p. 356.

Also in 1968, presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon promised to appoint an Indian to the Indian Claims Commission, and disavowed the policy of termination of Indian tribal entity and breakup of reservations. In 1969 he kept his promise by appointing Brantley Blue, a Lumbee Indian from North Carolina, to the Indian Claims Commission. On August 7, 1969, he nominated Robert L. Bennett, a Mohawk from New York, as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[6]

Two years later, after reviews of previous investigations, the Senate Subcommittee introduced a bill which was voted on and unanimously passed by the 92nd Congress on October 20, 1971. Known as the "Comprehensive Indian Education Act of 1971" (S. 2724), this bill had five sections and represented an attempt to establish a national Indian education program by creating a National Board of Regents for Indian Education.[7] The magnitude and seriousness of American Indian problems, especially in education, were at last being acknowledged.

Far from decreasing in the decade from 1960 to 1970, the problems of the American Indians had increased. The 1960 census had revealed 523,591 Indians in the United States; the 1970 census count was 792,730, an increase of over 50 percent. Indian birth rates were about double that of the United States as a whole.

---

[6]Ibid., pp. 356-57.

[7]Indian Education Legislation Seminar, Window Rock, Arizona, December 10-11, 1971, sponsored by the Navajo Division of Education.

The Indian longevity rate had risen to 63.8 years, seven years less than the national average.[8] Both birth rate and death rate are important factors in terms of population problems.

The largest Indian tribe in the United States today is the Navajo.[9] According to the 1970 census, the tribe numbers about 140,000, with approximately 45,000 school-age children.[10] It has been estimated that half of the Navajo population is under eighteen years of age. This is a highly significant fact in making plans for the future education of the Navajo.

That the Navajo tribe has been able to survive and increase testifies to its ability to adapt and change. In modern American society, formal education is designed to facilitate the successful adaptation and survival of its members within an environment under conditions that the society itself, to a large extent, has created. The educational system is one which the Anglo-American cultural communities have imposed on cultural minorities.[11] This formal education is an instrument used by

---

[8]Reader's Digest Almanac and Yearbook 1972 (Pleasantville, N.Y.: Reader's Digest Association, 1972), p. 155.

[9]Ruth M. Underhill, The Navajos (Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1956).

[10]Reader's Digest Almanac and Yearbook 1972, loc. cit.

[11]Robert W. Young, English as a Second Language for Navajos (Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Area Office, Division of Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1967).

the dominant society to generate and accelerate cultural change through the medium of "acculturation." This is the process by which such communities as the Navajo are induced and trained to participate in the dominant cultural system.[12]

The process of acculturation is long and difficult. In the case of the Navajos, it has been a century--from the Treaty of 1868 to the eventful year of 1968--a century of controversy and trouble, broken promises and agreements, and the process is by no means completed. Under the Treaty of 1868 between the Navajos and the United States government, the federal government assumed the obligation of providing a school and a teacher for every thirty Navajo children who could be "induced or compelled to attend school."[13] For their part, the Navajos promised to compel their children between the ages of six and sixteen to attend school. Both sides failed to live up to the agreement. The Navajos showed little interest in education, and not until 1881 was a school built.[14] Since that time, completely federally operated schools have been established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The years ahead show greater promise for tribal education. Both the government and the Navajo tribe have awakened to the need for compromise,

---

[12]Underhill, loc. cit.

[13]Lawrence C. Kelly, The Navajo Indians and Federal Indian Policy (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1968), p. 171.

[14]Robert W. Young and William Morgan, The Trouble at Round Rock (Navajo Historical Series No. 2: U.S. Department of the Interior, Division of Education: Haskell Press, 1952), p. 1.

the setting of educational goals, and the desirability of placing the responsibility for community schools in the hands of the Navajo people. A gradual transition has marked the establishment of community schools. At long last the Navajos and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are actively cooperating to increase the influence and responsibility of the tribe in respect to Navajo control and self-determination of education.

An important step in assuming control of a school system is the establishment of school boards. This step was taken by the Navajos in August of 1968 when the Navajo Community School Boards (NCSB) were formed. As yet these boards act only in an advisory capacity, but it is hoped that in the future the entire operation of community schools will be transferred to them. The specific goal is to involve the entire Navajo tribe in the eventual direction of all aspects of education for their children. The schools will then be truly schools of the community for the community.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was twofold: (1) to identify and investigate the sociological and economic characteristics of Navajo Community School Board members; and (2) to compare Navajo School Board members with general public school board members.

Is there a typical Navajo School Board member? Who is the NCSB member? What is he like? What is his education, his socio-economic status? What is his role? Is he elected or appointed,

and by what procedures? Do his duties and responsibilities differ from those of a state or local public school board member?

Answers to these and other related questions are needed to insure a better understanding of the revitalized interest and determination displayed by the Navajo in meeting the challenges of modern American life.

Need for the Study

Since the establishment of the Navajo Community School Boards in 1968, no study has been conducted to determine their composition, effectiveness, functions, and standing as a preliminary procedure towards transferring control of the schools to the Navajo communities. A need thus exists to study the NCSB members in order to achieve a better understanding of the present-day Navajo educational system and hopes for the future.

In recognition of the critical importance of education, the needs of the Navajo children must be fulfilled. This means the maximum involvement, participation, and direction of parents, tribal leaders, and all school personnel. The enthusiasm shown by the educators of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribe indicates that the recorded data would be vitally important. The NCSB system is undergoing stages of evaluation to determine the strengths and weaknesses concerning all phases of its operation on the Navajo Reservation. The data collected and analyzed by this study may be used to help in such evaluation.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were as follows: (1) to identify the social composition of the Navajo Community School Board members; (2) to identify the economic status of NCSB members; (3) to identify the educational status of NCSB members; (4) to ascertain the total length of service on the board by each NCSB member; and (5) to ascertain the method of selection of NCSB members.

Limitations of the Study

The present investigation was confined to members of the Navajo Community School Boards which oversee the operation of the federally controlled schools on the Navajo Reservation. These boards represent a system established for a unique population at a unique location. Therefore, results may not be generalized to other Indian tribes. Setting, subjects, culture, and language could not possibly be replicated. However, the study may provide some assistance to other Indian communities wishing to set up similar systems, especially in respect to method of selection and education deemed necessary for board members.

One major problem was encountered: the language difficulty. The majority of board members do not speak or read English. It was therefore necessary to provide assistance in interpreting the objectives and questions of the study. The Bureau of Indian Affairs school principals were very helpful in securing the

information, and in many cases, providing Navajo interpreters. Study results should be considered with this particular difficulty in mind.

Definitions of Terms

The study attempted to cover many aspects--social, economic, educational, and religious--of Navajo Community School Board members. It was therefore decided to list the definitions by groups in order to furnish the necessary background information.

1. Definition and administration.

The term Navajo refers to an Athabascan-speaking tribe of Indians, the largest tribe in the United States. This tribe occupies a reservation that covers northeast Arizona, northwest New Mexico, and extends into the southern edges of Colorado and Utah.

The term Zuñi refers to the largest of the nineteen groups of the Navajo Tribe. This group lives in the compact apartment-house villages located forty miles south of the Navajo Reservation. The Zuñi Pueblo encompasses the Zuñian linguistic family.

The term agency refers to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the administrative government subdivision in the Navajo Area. The five agencies are located at Crownpoint (Eastern Navajo), Shiprock in northern New Mexico; Chinle (Central), Fort Defiance (South Central), and Tuba City (Western) in Arizona. Window Rock, Arizona, is the Navajo capital, the seat of the tribal government, and the Navajo Area administrative headquarters of the United

States Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is directed from Washington, D.C.

The term chapter house refers to the local community facility, the equivalent of a town hall, entirely controlled by the chapter members represented by their elected chapter officers and tribal council delegates. All community affairs are presented to the chapter at a duly called meeting to efficiently carry out the functions and purposes of the chapter. There are approximately 101 local chapters or precincts on the reservation to provide facilities and services for the social needs of the people, in addition to serving as centers for local government.

The term Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity (ONEO) refers to the federally funded anti-poverty program operated by the Tribe. The program includes Navajo Pre-Vocational Training Program, Navajo Alcoholism Rehabitation and Education Program, Migrant Assistance Program, Headstart, Emergency Food and Medical Services, Local Community Development Program (LCDP), and Community Action Program (CAC). Much employment is made available through ONEO.

2. Education.

The term Navajo Community School Board (NCSB) refers to the recently established Indian boards of education in the Bureau of Indian Affairs' schools on the Navajo Reservation. Members of these boards serve in an advisory capacity.

The term Navajo-controlled (contracted) refers to schools which were originally established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and later contracted out to the Navajo Tribe to operate. These schools represent a pilot effort in Indian-directed educational programs intended to foster pride in Navajo culture.

The term boarding school refers to the Navajo boarding school system with one major stipulation for applicants: the applicant must live more than one and a half miles from the bus route. Combination of many factors influence the necessity for the continued operation of boarding school facilities to serve a large portion of the school-age group.

The term day school refers to the educational system operated on a day basis by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The term bordertown dormitory refers to the peripheral town dormitory programs involving the enrollment of Navajo children in the public school system in towns bordering the reservation.

The term public school refers to the state-operated schools on the reservation enrolling Navajo children from the areas. The schools receive federal financial assistance, i.e., Impact Aid, Johnson-O'Malley (National School Lunch Program), and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This federal funding is granted by reason of Indian children enrollment.

The term mission school refers to sectarian educational facilities, located on or near the reservation, and financed entirely by churches and other non-federal sources.

3. Religion.

The term Native American Church (NAC) refers to an organized Peyote religion, the largest of the new Indian religions. The ethics of the NAC closely parallel those of Christianity, but emphasis is placed on Indian elements and patterns. Many Navajo communities have divided into three religious groups: Traditionalists, Peyotists, and Christians.

The term Navajo Traditionalist refers to those Navajos who retain belief in Navajo native religion and culture.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature in respect to the development of public schools boards and their present-day functions. The history of Navajo education is briefly discussed, with emphasis on the establishment and aims of the Navajo Community School Boards. Chapter 3 presents the study's method of investigation, sources of data, and the questionnaire used. Chapter 4 is a presentation of the findings, with tables and explanatory text. Chapter 5 contains a summary, conclusions, and recommendations. A bibliography and two appendices finish the presentation of the study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the historical background and present-day functions and composition of public schools boards of education. This is followed by a description of the history of Navajo education and a detailed discussion of the Navajo Community School Board system.

Introduction

National concern for the improvement of educational opportunities, especially in recent years, and the concomitant interest in the holding powers of the schools have led to repeated inquiries about the responsibilities of boards of education. Although differences do exist in school district organization and in laws affecting boards of education, the general functions of most public school boards can be assumed as common to most situations.[1]

Historical Background of Public Education

Although public education in the United States took its inspiration from the Massachusetts laws of 1642 and 1647,[2] the

---

[1]Thurman M. White, "A Socio-Economic Attitudinal Study of New Mexico School Board Members and School Superintendents" (unpublished Specialist in Education study, New Mexico State University, 1965), p. 7.

[2]Arthur B. Moehlman, School Administration: Its Development, Principles, and Future in the United States (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940), p. 11.

present public school system is actually little more than a century old. Despite the passage of the Massachusetts laws, American schools during the seventeenth and eighteeenth centuries were essentially private or church institutions. These schools were few and attendance was usually selective. Under English Common Law, which still prevailed in the colonies, a parent had practically unlimited authority over his children's education. Whether or not the father sent his children to school appeared to depend on family finances, attitude towards education, and need for children to work on the family homestead. Still, a public school system was beginning to emerge, with its most significant aspect, according to Butts, as the public "elementary--or common--school."[3] The fight for control of schools during colonial days was really the effort to transfer the schools from the jurisdiction of religious authorities to that of civil authorities.[4]

Early control of public schools. State authority over public schools began soon after the settlement of the colonies. It was further confirmed in 1693 by a law jointly charging the towns and their selectmen with the duty of maintaining schools and levying taxes for school support if so directed by vote of

---

[3]Freeman Butts, A History of Education in American Culture (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), p. 242.

[4]Ibid., p. 253.

the people in town meeting.[5] Thus, during the early history of the United States, school management was a function performed by lay citizens according to the will of the local community.

Development of local school board systems. Emerging from its simple beginnings in town meetings, the American school board has become an important force in the continuation and improvement of public education. Further, it is a manifestation of American decentralized education. With the growth of cities and the merger of school districts within cities, the problems of school administration became too demanding for part-time lay school board members,[6] except in the smaller towns and rural areas. Goldhammer characterized the school board when he wrote:

> The American school board is a distinctively indigenous innovation. It has evolved from its initial function of supervision . . . to policy-making body for the vast educational enterprises which are found in the larger school districts of the United States.[7]

The Public School Board Today

If Americans had not proclaimed the ideals of separation of church and state, and of a common school attended by children

---

[5]Charles S. Reeves, School Boards: Their Status, Functions, and Activities (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954), p. 19.

[6]Roald F. Campbell, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970), p. 9.

[7]Keith Goldhammer, The School Board (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964), p. 1.

of all groups, the pattern of state-controlled common school systems might never have been formed. Moehlman agreed when he stated:

> . . . The American struggle for independence was only one aspect of a much wider revolutionary movement in the western world which extended from the middle of the eighteenth century into the first half of the nineteenth. Out of this political revolution emerged the modern concept of the state.[8]

Functions of the school board. Early in its history, the local board of education was entrusted with considerable legal authority. It served as an executive, as well as a legislative, body.[9] The school board, then, is an instrument of the legislature, established for the purpose of managing the affairs of the school district.

According to Johnson,[10] Koerner,[11] Reeves,[12] and other authorities on public education, the school board is a vital link between the community and its schools; consequently, it is in a strategic position for public relations programs. Johnson said:

---

[8]Moehlman, op. cit., p. 13.

[9]Stephen J. Kanezevich, Jr., Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 215.

[10]Robert H. Johnson, The School Board and Public Relations (New York: Exposition Press, 1964), p. 17.

[11]James D. Koerner, Who Controls American Education? A Guide for Laymen (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 122.

[12]Reeves, op. cit., p. 2.

> The board has two principal public relations duties: (1) to present to the professional staff the thoughts and actions of the community that concern the schools; and (2) to interpret to the community the objectives and actions of the schools.[13]

Included among the school board's responsibilities is that of standing ready to meet the constitutional demands of the state lawmakers. Furthermore, the school board has the following duties, listed by Kanezevich:

> 1. Establish general objectives, goals or missions of the organization.
> 2. Determine its major operating policies.
> 3. Determine the organizational structure.
> 4. Select major executives for the organization.
> 5. Appraise performance of executives to whom responsibilities have been delegated and evaluate how well stated goals have been achieved.[14]

Reeder,[15] Strayer,[16] Reeves,[17] and Kanezevich[19] were in agreement that a decentralized system of school administration has been maintained in most of the states of the Union. Any consideration of the policies governing the administration of schools must, of course, include the responsibility and control exercised

---

[13]Johnson, op. cit., p. 45.

[14]Kanezevich, loc. cit.

[15]Ward G. Reeder, School Boards and Superintendents (New York: Macmillan Co., 1946), p. 17.

[16]George D. Strayer, The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy (Washington: Educational Policies Commission, NEA and AASA, 1938), p. 41.

[17]Reeves, op. cit., p. 2.

[18]Kanezevich, loc. cit.

by the state and by the nation. Therefore, school boards should regard themselves as agents of the state for carrying out the educational policies determined by the state. Local regulations also must be carried out as part of the boards' responsibilities to the communities.

The literature on school boards is filled with descriptions of what good school boards are like and should do. Much of what has been written reflects a healthy idealism and in that way probably has contributed to education.

Composition of school boards. Numerous studies have been done on the social composition of school boards. The study published by George S. Counts in 1927 was probably the earliest.[19] Subsequent studies investigated various factors such as motivation for seeking election to the school board, school board effectiveness, and the relation between effectiveness and education, status, and sex.

When Gross conducted his study in the early 1950's on the school board members in Massachusetts, he found that sex, children, education, and marital status made little difference in motivation for seeking election to the school board.[20] The study by Stapley

---

[19]George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927), p. 137.

[20]Neal C. Gross, Schoolboard: Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley, 1958), p. 70.

showed that school board effectiveness was related to the board member's formal education, length of service on the board (up to six years), the member's own economic success, and the amount of time he could devote to public service. Sex, age, and the fact of parenthood had little or no relation to effectiveness as a school board member.[21] Reeder appeared to disagree with Stapley when he stated that formal education was not necessary since "many persons who have received little formal education are well educated and make excellent school board members."[22] As for the status of school board members, Gross remarked:

> It is not true that school board members with high status are better able . . .. Occupation doesn't matter. Both kinds are just as likely to adhere to professional standards for school board behavior.[23]

In summary, no public position is more important than that of school board membership. School boards largely determine what the schools are, and the schools of today largely determine what the citizens of the next generation will be. School board members are "community servants." If they desire to and are qualified, they can easily become community statesmen and makers of history. Therefore, they should be among the most competent and highly respected residents of the community. There is no

---

[21]Maurice E. Stapley, Schoolboard Studies (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957), p. 3.

[22]Reeder, op. cit., p. 4.

[23]Gross, op. cit., p. 98.

concrete formula for determining the types of persons who make efficient school board members. However, it is apparent that persons who are genuinely interested in education--its policies, goals, and effectiveness--will make good board members.

Historical Background of Navajo Education

Little is known of early Navajo history. At some point between 1000 and 1500 A.D., the Athabascan ancestors of today's Navajos migrated to the Southwest in small bands from farther north.[24] Some historians feel that the Athabascans had only recently arrived when the Spaniards came in the mid-1500's, while others feel they may have been here several centuries earlier.

After the Spaniards came, the Navajos acquired numerous patterns of life that many still follow. During Spanish and Mexican rule, the Navajos were not conquered; nor were they conquered during the first two decades of United States jurisdiction over the Southwest. A series of treaties between the Navajos and the government of the United States was drawn up during this time and broken by both sides, and war erupted intermittently.[25] Then Colonel Kit Carson headed a campaign by the U.S. Army to subdue the Navajos and finally succeeded in starving them into surrendering in 1864. Eight thousand Navajos--half the tribe--

---

[24]Miles V. Zintz, Education Across Cultures (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1963), p. 139.

[25]Southwest Indian Country (A Sunset Travel Book; Menlo Park, Calif.: Lane Magazine and Book Co., 1970), p. 13.

began the "Long Walk" to Fort Sumner, New Mexico, where they were confined for four years. Finally, under the Treaty of 1868, they were allowed to return to a portion of their homelands.[26]

Signed after three days of negotiations, the Treaty of 1868 between the Navajos and the United States government contained the following agreement (Article 6) on education:

> In order to insure the civilization of the Indians entering into this treaty, the necessity of education is admitted, especially of such of them as may be settled on agricultural parts of this Reservation, and they therefore pledge themselves to compel their children, male and female, between the ages of six and sixteen years, to attend school; and it is hereby made the duty of the agent for said Indians to see that this stipulation is strictly complied with; and the United States agrees that, for every thirty children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided, and a teacher competent to teach the elementary branches of an English education shall be furnished, who will reside among said Indians, and faithfully discharge his or her duties as a teacher. The provisions of this article to continue for not less than ten years.[27]

Both parties to this agreement were lax in carrying out its provisions. Since no school was provided for many years, it was obviously impossible for the Navajos to live up to their part of the agreement. Church-sponsored schools were initiated in 1870, but were unsuccessful. In 1880 the first boarding school was

---

[26]Ibid.

[27]Treaty Between the United States of America and the Navajo Tribe of Indians (Flagstaff, Arizona: K. C. Publications, 1958), p. 21.

constructed at Fort Defiance by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[28] The Navajos had no great interest in formal education. Furthermore, the widely scattered population, the great distances to be traveled, lack of transportation facilities, and lack of adequate roads presented apparently unbeatable difficulties. These problems would be resolved later by establishment of more boarding schools and development of transportation systems.

Early twentieth century. During the early 1900's, additional schools were constructed at various locations on the vast Navajo Reservation. In addition, some of the Navajo students attended off-reservation facilities constructed for purposes of Indian education. This leisurely progress was enhanced by the fact that the Navajos saw no particular need for education, nor were they subjected to pressure for cultural changes requiring formal education as necessary for successful adaptation. However, the Meriam Report of 1928 gave food for thought of the necessary expansion needs of Indian education through descriptions of existing schools.

Mid-twentieth century to the present. A new era for Navajo education had its beginnings with World War II. Since Navajos had been granted citizenship by act of Congress in 1924,

---

[28]Robert W. Young, The Navajo Yearbook. VIII. 1951-1961: A Decade of Progress (Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Agency, 1961), pp. 8-11.

as had all Indian tribes, they were free to come and go on their reservation, own property, vote, and hold public office; they had the same rights and obligations as other U.S. citizens--including military service.[29] Young Navajo men served honorably and well in the armed forces. Those who returned to the reservation brought with them a new perception of the value of education. Others who remained in the world beyond the reservation also perceived the value of education and the difficulties inherent in attempting to live within two cultures--the contemporary culture of the American white people and the culture of the Navajo. "They were confronted with wage work, off-reservation experiences . . . and other opportunities which opened the eyes of many Navajos."[30]

The tempo of school expansion for the Navajos quickened in the 40's with the establishment of the Navajo Emergency Education Program (NEEP). The objective of this program was to provide educational facilities for an additional 7,946 Navajo children by September of 1954, to raise the enrollment. Other educational efforts included the publication of a Navajo-English dictionary in 1958.[31]

---

[29]Reader's Digest Almanac and Yearbook 1969 (Pleasantville, N.Y.: Reader's Digest Association, 1969), p. 150.

[30]Ruth Roessel, Navajo Studies at Navajo Community Colleges (Many Farms, Arizona: College Press, 1971), p. 37.

[31]Leon Wall and William Morgan, Navajo-English Dictionary (Washington: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1958). (ED 022 618)

During the 1960's, the Navajos were the focal point of studies on many aspects of education, such as the difficulties of teaching English to Navajo children,[32] a new type of school for Navajo children,[33] plans for a Navajo community college,[34] and other topics related to both on-reservation and off-reservation Navajos. In 1968 a report from the Navajo Tribal Education Committee to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education showed that the tribal committee's main accomplishment was an increased involvement of parents and tribal leaders in the school program.[35] This meant that the Navajos were well on their way to achieving self-determination and self-control of their schools.

The Navajo Community School Boards

Literature on studies concerning the Navajo Community School Board (NCSB) system is very limited. Hence, it is believed that at this point the study should explain the Navajo Community

---

[32]Navajo Tribe Education Committee, Teaching of English to Navajo Children (Fourth Annual Conference on Navajo Education, University of New Mexico, January 22-25, 1961; Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Tribe Education Committee, 1961). (ED 021 667).

[33]Robert A. Roessel, Jr., The Right To Be Wrong and the Right To Be Right (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1968). (ED 018 382)

[34]Robert W. Ashe, Survey Report--Navajo Community College (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1966). (ED 017 229)

[35]Allen D. Yazzie, Yazzie Reports on Education Activities (Navajo Tribe Public Relations and Information Department, 1968). (ED 020 825)

School Boards with relation to establishment, aims and goals, policies, functions and duties, and code of ethics.

Establishment, aims, and goals of the NCSB. After a century of baffling difficulties and searching for solutions to problems of education, the Navajo Tribal Council passed a resolution on August 8, 1968, to establish the Navajo Community School Boards.[36] Stout characterized the NCSB in this manner: "The local school board is the group in the community closest to the people of the community, both those who have children and those who do not."[37] This definition reflects the public school board's responsibilities, according to Gross, who stated that under the American system of public education, control of the schools is anchored in the local community.[38] Citizens have a right to ask questions about their schools and to have them frankly answered.

The aims and goals of the Navajo Community School Boards were set forth by the Tribal Education Committee as follows:

1. To seek maximum, feasible involvement of parents and tribal leaders in the educational program.
2. To attack the unique problems of Indian students by the provision of unique programs suited to the needs of these students, such as the ESL program.
3. To develop a public information program on a continuing basis which reflects progress made.

---

[36]Irving W. Stout, A Manual for Navajo Community School Board Members (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1969), p. 56.

[37]Ibid., p. 66.

[38]Gross, op. cit., p. 135.

> 4. To endeavor to assist in any way possible so that full utilization can be made of resources, including the Economic Opportunity Act, Public Laws 89-10, and other similar programs which can benefit the Indian people.[39]

The long-term, overall objective of the NCSB is to obtain the full responsibility for the operation and maintenance of all Navajo schools, and thus be able to carry out the Navajo people's wishes for their children's education. To do this, the Navajos must prove themselves capable of the deed as well as the intent.

Policies governing the NCSB. As board members are experiencing, policies and responsibilities are still in the process of being tested. According to the NCSB, the following are subjects of policies:

1. Civil service procedures for securing and dismissing personnel (like state laws regulating public school employment).
2. Employee negotiations.
3. School principal selection.
4. Arrangement of interviews by the principal and the superintendent.
5. Non-civil service selections.
6. Teacher qualifications.
7. Other personnel qualifications.
8. Job requirements and privileges.
9. Curriculum.

---

[39]Stout, op. cit., p. 6.

Functions and duties of the NCSB. Koerner said that the post of school board member is perhaps the most ill-defined in local government.[40] The NCSB members consider themselves and the principal to be a team with the principal as an ex-officio non-voting member. The individual board works as a whole; no member works alone except as directed by the board and in cooperation with the principal. The individual board member has no legal power, although the board itself is considered a corporation.

The primary function of a school board is to determine purposes and goals of the schools, arrange for facilities and their use, advise on financing, and represent the people of the chapter in giving direction to the school. More specifically, the board carries the school's message to the community, consults regularly with the principal on school affairs, and has a voice in determining selection of personnel of the school. The board's functions include: (1) establishment of broad educational policies; (2) review and sanction of all curricular changes; (3) use of school buildings; (4) public relations; (5) community involvement; (6) parent involvement; (7) management and instruction; (8) enrollment; (9) handling local school affairs.

All school board members, whether Navajo, state, or local, bear accountability to a higher body in the hierarchy of school administration. Gross said: "It must never be forgotten that

---

[40]Koerner, op. cit., p. 122.

school board members, although elected or appointed at local community level, are still officials of the state."[41] In the case of NCSB members, they would not be responsible to the state, but to the Tribal Council and the Department of Education in Window Rock.

Summary

The American school board is a unique development of American education. Originally it began with town meetings when selectmen were charged with the duty of maintaining the schools, including the right to levy taxes for school support. Today, the public school board is a legislative, executive, and public relations power. Sex, education, length of service, socio-economic status, and other factors do not appear to bear much relation to a school board member's effectiveness.

The functions of the Navajo Community School Boards are very much like those of public school boards except that the NCSB's act in an advisory capacity only. Although public school boards are responsible to the state, NCSB members are responsible to the Tribal Council and Department of Education. What relation NCSB members' sex, education, length of service, socioeconomic status, and other related aspects bear to effectiveness as board members has not yet been determined.

---

[41] Gross, op. cit., p. 10.

Chapter 3

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the instrument designed to elicit the desired information, the distribution of the instrument, and the method of handling the collected data.

The primary goal of the study was to identify and investigate the sociological and economic characteristics of Navajo Community School Board (NCSB) members on the Navajo Reservation. It was also intended, if feasible, to compare NCSB members with public school board members in general. Therefore, the following specific objectives were set forth: (1) to identify the social composition of Navajo Community School Boards; (2) to identify the economic status of NCSB members; (3) to identify the educational status of NCSB members; (4) to ascertain the total length of service on the board by each NCSB member; and (5) to ascertain the method of selection of NCSB members.

The Instrument

To obtain the desired data, it was proposed to conduct a survey by means of a questionnaire. In devising the questionnaire, it was necessary to keep in mind the fact that many Navajos either do not speak, read, or write English, or do so but imperfectly. Interpretation into Navajo and back into English might entail some misunderstandings. Therefore, the questionnaire (Appendix A)

was made as simple, clear, and brief as possible. No opinions were asked. Twenty-two items were listed, all of the fill-in or check-off type. Items on the questionnaire were grouped to a certain extent. Name, address, marital status, age and place of birth were asked for first. The next group of questions pertained to number and education of the respondent's children. The subsequent group of questions pertained to church preference, language(s) spoken, schools attended and level of education attained. Item Number 17 asked, "What is your occupation?" Since this question involved categorization procedures, it will be discussed presently in more detail. This question might have been the occasion for some difficulty in answering because no list of occupations was included for check-off. However, any difficulties presented by this question were not apparent on the final results. Items 18, 19, 20, and 21 were concerned with service on the NCSB. The last item was a courtesy question which asked the respondent if he would care to have a copy of study results.

An appropriate cover letter explained the objectives of the study and assured the respondent that all information would be treated confidentially and in a professional manner. The respondent was asked to fill out the questionnaire and mail it in the enclosed return envelope or give it to the school principal. The letter (Appendix A) was dated March 13, 1972.

Item 17, as previously mentioned, asked, "What is your occupation?" Although no list of occupations was given on the questionnaire, occupations were divided into the following categories to facilitate tabulation: The term professional included educators, school administrators, and business managers. The term skilled included trained electricians, mechanics, and those of other skilled trades. Semi-skilled referred to teacher aides, cooks, painters, and trainees in various fields. The unskilled or labor category included railroad employees, janitors, and other "blue-collar" workers. The terms self-employed and housewife are self-explanatory. The term self-employed included farm and livestock owners, ranchers, traditional medicine men, rug weavers, silversmiths, tanners, and others engaged in various arts and crafts to supplement the family income.

One rather unique category was termed tribal employee. This category is not found on most lists of occupations because it pertains to persons employed by the Navajo Tribe, such as local chapter officers, council delegates, and members of other committees established and funded by the Navajo Tribe. Persons engaged in ONEO and other related tribal activities were included in this category also because most of the employees work directly with the people. These persons are employed in such activities as Tribal Work Experience Program (TWEP), Local Community Development Program (LCDP), and Community Action Committee (CAC).

Organization of the Navajo School System

The Navajo Tribal Council and the Navajo Tribal Education Committee oversee all educational activities on the reservation. This is done in cooperation with the Navajo Area Educational Tribal Liaison Officer, Bureau of Indian Affairs, at Window Rock. The Navajo Area is divided into five agencies (Crownpoint and Shiprock in New Mexico; and Chinle, Fort Defiance, and Tuba City in Arizona). Each agency has a superintendent who is responsible for NCSB activities and involvement within his area.

The top structure of school boards is the Interagency School Board, established to consider programs and problems of reservation-wide significance. The Interagency Board has ten members, two from each Agency School Board. Each Agency School Board consists of one representative from each local school board.

A local school board was established for each of the forty-four federally operated boarding schools and the ten day schools on the reservation. In addition, eight bordertown dormitories surrounding the reservation have local boards, and the two existing Navajo-contracted schools have local boards. Of these, boards of the Navajo-contracted schools (Ramah and Rough Rock Demonstration School) were included in the study, as were the boards for the federally operated boarding schools and the day schools. However, only four bordertown dormitories (Winslow, Snowflake, and Holbrook in Arizona, and Gallup Manuelito in New

Mexico) were included. The other four bordertown dormitories (Magdalena and Aztec in New Mexico, Richfield in Utah, and Flagstaff in Arizona) were excluded because these were more isolated from the reservation.

Distribution of the Questionnaire

The 1969-70 School Board Directory was used to obtain the listing of the number of board members in each agency. Only approximate numbers of questionnaires were sent to each selected school because current listings of board members were not available at Window Rock.

Additional sources were the personal files of board members at the following offices: (1) Navajo Tribal Headquarters; (2) the Educational Tribal Liaison Officer; and (3) the five agency school superintendents.

Copies of the questionnaire and cover letter were mailed to each board member (320 total) at chapter, precinct, and local addresses. To insure complete coverage, additional questionnaires and cover letters were mailed to school principals. Separate letters were written to the school principals and agency superintendents. Each letter, dated March 13, 1972, explained the purpose of the study and asked for cooperation and assistance (Appendix B). On the assumption that school principals had close contact with board members, they were reminded of possible language difficulties and were asked to help. Superintendent support was

asked because of their influence and reputation. No cut-off date was mentioned in any of these letters.

Follow-Up Procedure

Approximately two months were allowed for completion and return of the questionnaires. It was realized that the language problem might take time to work out. However, on May 4, 1972, a follow-up letter was mailed to nonrespondents, urging their participation in this valuable project and helping to meet the deadline of May 18. In addition, telephone calls were made to school superintendents. Also, requests for cooperation in filling out and returning the questionnaires were made at some of the NCSB agency training sessions. Some personal interviews were necessary; arrangements for these were made during the internship session when closer contact with most of the schools in the Navajo Area was possible.

Responses

A response rate of 100 percent would have been most desirable. However, educational authorities have stated that most mailed questionnaires obtain lower rates of response. For example, Harris said that in practice a 60 percent response is a fairly good accomplishment.[1] Kerlinger stated that returns of

---

[1]Chester W. Harris, "Current Status of Survey Research," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd edition; New York: Macmillan Co., 1960), p. 1448.

less than 40 or 50 percent are common.[2] Good indicated that a return of 72 percent was considered significant.[3] In the present study, 320 questionnaires were sent out and 192 responses were received, representing a return of 60 percent. When the difficulties to be overcome as to language, time consumed in locating interpreters when necessary, and the aid given by principals, are considered, 60 percent seems an adequate rate of response.

According to Table 1, Eastern Navajo Agency, the largest agency, received 122 questionnaires and returned 71 or 58.1 percent. Fort Defiance showed the largest percentage of returns (80.0 percent), while Chinle, the smallest agency, received 40 questionnaires and returned 28, for a response rate of 70.0 percent.

Treatment of the Data

Data from the subjects were tabulated and categorized by agencies. Simple numerical methods were used. Tables were constructed and narrative analyses were made.

---

[2]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 394.

[3]Carter V. Good, Introduction to Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), pp. 282-83.

Table 1

Responses of Navajo Community School Board Members
to Questionnaires

Type of School Represented	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Boarding and day schools						
No. questionnaires sent	111	51	45	33	57	297
No. questionnaires returned	67	28	36	28	25	184
Bordertown dormitory						
No. questionnaires sent	5	--[a]	5	--	--	10
No. questionnaires returned	0	--	4	--	--	4
Navajo-controlled (contracted)						
No. questionnaires sent	6	--	--	7	--	13
No. questionnaires returned	4	--	--	0	--	4
Total number sent	122	51	50	40	57	320
Total number returned	71	28	40	28	25	192
Percentage of responses	58.1	54.9	80.0	70.0	43.8	60.0

[a]Null entries mean no school exists in that agency.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings in tabular form, with an accompanying text. Occasionally, findings on certain topics are compared with findings of other research studies conducted on public school board members. However, a more complete comparison is presented in Chapter 5.

Sex of Respondents

Data in Table 2 show the sexes of the respondents within agencies and for the total. Males comprised 70.3 percent, while females comprised 29.7 percent. Within agencies, Tuba City showed the highest percentage of males (84.0 percent); Eastern Navajo showed the highest female percentage (36.6 percent). The agency with the lowest percentage of male respondents was Fort Defiance (65.0 percent), and Tuba City had the lowest percentage of female respondents (16.0 percent).

Marital Status of Respondents

Table 3 shows the marital status of respondents by agency and total. Most of the respondents (170) were married, representing 88.5 percent of the total. Within agencies, Shiprock had the highest percentage of married respondents (96.4 percent), while Tuba City was runner-up with 96.0 percent. Eastern Navajo, although

Table 2

Sex of Respondents

Sex	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Male	(45)[a] 63.4%	(20) 71.4%	(26) 65.0%	(23) 82.1%	(21) 84.0%	(135) 70.3%
Female	(26) 36.6%	(8) 28.6%	(14) 35.0%	(5) 17.9%	(4) 16.0%	(57) 29.7%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

Table 3

Marital Status of Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Marital Status	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Single	(4)[a] 5.6%	(1) 3.6%	(3) 7.5%	(-) -	(-) -	(8) 4.2%
Married	(59) 83.1%	(27) 96.4%	(36) 90.0%	(24) 85.7%	(24) 96.0%	(170) 88.5%
Divorced	(5) 7.0%	(-) -	(1) 2.5%	(4) 14.3%	(-) -	(10) 5.2%
Separated	(1) 1.4%	(-) -	(-) -	(-) -	(-) -	(1) 0.5%
Widowed	(2) 2.8%	(-) -	(-) -	(-) -	(1) 4.0%	(3) 1.6%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

it had the largest number (59) of married respondents, showed the lowest percentage (83.1 percent). Within the divorced category, Eastern Navajo had the largest number (5) for a percentage of 7.0 percent, although Chinle was close with 4 divorced respondents representing 14.3 percent. A total of 10 respondents, representing 5.2 percent, was reported for the divorced category.

Among agencies reporting single respondents. Fort Defiance had 3 (7.5 percent) and Eastern Navajo had 4 (5.6 percent). The total of single persons on the boards was 8 or 4.2 percent. Widowed respondents totaled 3 for a percentage of 1.6, and separated persons numbered only 1 (Eastern Navajo) for a percentage of 0.5, of the total.

Age of Respondents

Respondents were not asked to state their exact ages, only to check off the intervals given on the questionnaire (Table 4). The interval 50-59 years was checked by 60 respondents, representing 31.3 percent of the total. These were followed by 53 in the 40-49 age group, 33 in the 60-69 age group, and 30 in the 30-39 age group, representing 27.6 percent, 17.2 percent, and 15.6 percent, respectively. It is interesting to note that the youngest age and oldest age groups had the fewest of all, 7 and 9, respectively, representing 3.6 and 4.7 percents of the total.

Within agencies, Eastern Navajo showed the highest number (15) with the highest percentage (21.1 percent) in the 30-39 age

Table 4

Age of Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Age in Years	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
20-29	(4)[a] 5.6%	(1) 3.6%	(-) -	(1) 3.6%	(1) 4.0%	(7) 3.6%
30-39	(15) 21.1%	(4) 14.3%	(8) 20.0%	(2) 7.1%	(1) 4.0%	(30) 15.6%
40-49	(19) 26.8%	(9) 32.1%	(11) 27.5%	(7) 25.0%	(7) 28.0%	(53) 27.6%
50-59	(17) 23.9%	(6) 21.4%	(13) 32.5%	(10) 35.7%	(14) 56.0%	(60) 31.3%
60-69	(12) 16.9%	(8) 26.6%	(6) 15.0%	(5) 17.9%	(2) 8.0%	(33) 17.2%
70 and over	(4) 5.6%	(-) -	(2) 5.0%	(3) 10.7%	(-) -	(9) 4.7%

[a]Numbers in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

group, but its highest number was in the 40-49 group with 19 respondents, representing 26.8 percent. Shiprock's highest percentage was in the 60-69 bracket, or 26.6 percent. This was also the highest percentage in that age group for all agencies.

Only three agencies, Eastern Navajo, Fort Defiance, and Chinle, showed respondents over 70. These percentages were as follows: Eastern Navajo, 5.6 percent; Fort Defiance, 5.0 percent; and Chinle, 10.7 percent. Apparently Tuba City had no respondents age 70 or over, and only 1 (4.0 percent) in the 20-29 age group. Eastern Navajo had the highest percentage of all agencies in the 20-29 age group (5.6 percent).

It was concluded that the average age of the Navajo Community School Board members ranged between 50 and 59 years. The implication would seem to be that the youngest and oldest age groups did not yield individuals considered suitable for the position.

Place of Birth of Respondents

Respondents were asked to check state of birth on the questionnaire: Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, or Colorado. Table 5 shows that 51.6 percent were born in New Mexico, 45.8 percent in Arizona, and 2.6 percent in Utah. None claimed Colorado as state of birth. This information came from board members of 18 schools in New Mexico, 19 in Arizona, and one in Utah. The item was included because of the unique educational system on the reservation which covers three states (New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah), and to determine board members' mobility.

Table 5

Place of Birth of Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Place of Birth	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
New Mexico	(70)[a] 98.6%	(18) 64.3%	(8) 20.0%	(1) 3.6%	(2) 8.0%	(99) 51.6%
Arizona	(1) 1.4%	(6) 21.4%	(32) 80.0%	(27) 96.4%	(22) 88.0%	(88) 45.8%
Utah	(-) -	(4) 14.3%	(-) -	(-) -	(1) 4.0%	(5) 2.6%

[a]Numbers in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

All five agencies yielded respondents who claimed states of birth other than those of present residence. Eastern Navajo, located entirely in New Mexico, had 98.6 percent of its respondents born in New Mexico and 1.4 percent in Arizona. Shiprock in New Mexico includes portions of southern Utah; its respondents named Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah as states of birth. Fort Defiance, a border agency, includes portions of New Mexico and Arizona; 80.0 percent of Fort Defiance respondents named Arizona and 20.0 percent named New Mexico as states of birth. Located in Arizona, Chinle had 3.6 percent of its respondents who were born in New Mexico, and the remainder born in Arizona. Tuba City Agency, which includes portions of southern Utah and Arizona, had 88.0 percent who had been born in Arizona, 4 percent born in Utah, and 8.0 percent born in New Mexico.

The data would seem to indicate that the greatest mobility was achieved by respondents living in the border agencies. This appeared to be a perfectly natural phenomenon.

Attendance of Respondents' Children by School Types

Data in Table 6 show that 44.6 percent of the respondents' children had attended or were attending the federally operated Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. For the remainder, 30.2 percent children had attended or were attending public schools on the reservation; 22.7 percent children were attending private or parochial schools. There were only 11.8 percent children reported

Table 6

Attendance of Respondents' Children by School Type
(Percentage of Total)

Type of School	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Bureau of Indian Affairs	(48)[a] 38.6%	(20) 51.5%	(27) 47.0%	(23) 53.9%	(18) 37.7%	(136) 44.6%
State public	(32) 37.5%	(19) 23.1%	(27) 32.5%	(10) 15.0%	(15) 30.0%	(103) 30.2%
Private or parochial	(11) 21.8%	(31) 16.6%	(9) 26.6%	(2) 25.0%	(4) 20.0%	(29) 22.7%
Navajo-controlled (contracted)	(6) 1.0%	(1) 1.0%	(2) 1.0%	(2) 2.0%	(-) -	(11) 11.8%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

who had attended or were attending the Navajo-controlled (contracted) schools. This type of school is a relatively new kind of educational institution in the Navajo Area.

Chinle Agency had the highest percentage (53.9 percent) with children who had attended or were attending Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, while Tuba City reported the low of 37.7 percent. For state public schools, Eastern Navajo reported the high of 37.5 percent, while Chinle reported the low of 15.0 percent. Fort Defiance had the high of 26.6 percent for attendance at private or parochial schools, with Chinle running a close second (25.0 percent), and Shiprock reporting only 16.6 percent.

Only Tuba City respondents did not report children in the Navajo-controlled schools. Chinle had the high of 2.0 percent, while Eastern Navajo, Shiprock, and Fort Defiance reported 1.0 percent each.

Apparently many families had children attending private or parochial schools and other children attending federal BIA schools at the same time. Sometimes older children were reported attending boarding schools farther away from home because these schools were not available in the immediate area.

Church Preference of Respondents

Data in Table 7 indicate church preferences of board members in the Navajo Area. Protestant affiliation was preferred by the largest membership (58.3 percent). Within the Protestant category, the following percentages of preference were reported:

Table 7

Church Preference of Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Church Preference	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Protestant[a]	70.4%	71.4%	21.0%	25.0%	64.0%	58.3%
Christian Reform	25.3[a]	39.2[a]	-	-	-	15.1
Assembly of God (Pentecostal)	12.6	-	5.4	-	5.0	6.7
Presbyterian	5.6	-	18.9[a]	3.5	10.0	7.2
Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints	11.2	21.4	8.1	3.5	25.0[a]	11.1
Baptist	8.4	-	8.1	10.7[a]	20.0[b]	8.3
Roman Catholic	8.4	7.1	29.7	57.1	20.0[b]	20.8
Traditional Navajo	21.1[b]	3.5	10.8	39.2	12.0	17.7
Native American Church	11.2	25.0[b]	35.0[b]	39.2	12.0	22.3
Other (Zuñi)	-	3.5%	-	-	-	5.2%

[a]Listing of the most dominant Protestant preference in each agency.

[b]Listing of second most preferred church in each agency.

Christian Reform, 15.1 percent; Assembly of God, 6.7 percent; Presbyterian, 7.2 percent; Latter-Day Saints, 11.1 percent; and Baptist, 8.3 percent. Roman Catholic preference was indicated by 20.8 percent, Traditional Navajo by 17.7 percent, the Native American Church by 22.3 percent, and Other (Zuñi) by 5.2 percent.

Within the Protestant category, Eastern Navajo respondents showed 25.3 percent in favor of Christian Reform, and 12.6 percent for Assembly of God. Of Shiprock respondents, 39.2 percent favored Christian Reform, and 21.4 percent favored Latter-Day Saints. The highest percentage (18.9 percent) of Fort Defiance respondents preferred the Presbyterian churches; for Chinle, the Latter-Day Saints and the Baptists were each preferred by 3.5 percent.

Roman Catholic was preferred by 57.1 percent of Chinle respondents; this was the highest percentage for this religious affiliation reported by the agencies. Fort Defiance showed 29.7 percent for Roman Catholic, while Shiprock was the lowest with 7.1 percent expressing Catholic preference.

Chinle respondents showed the highest percentages in both the Traditional Navajo and Native American Church, with 39.2 percent in both instances. Shiprock reported the lowest percentage for Traditional Navajo preference, or 3.5 percent, while Eastern Navajo showed the lowest for the Native American Church, or 11.2 percent. Only Shiprock reported Other (Zuñi) membership of 3.5 percent.

Several respondents listed two or three church preferences, such as one Christian preference, along with the Navajo Traditionalist religion or the Native American Church. A Navajo may have a traditional ceremony on a Saturday night and be seen attending a church the next morning, thus indicating more than one religious preference.

Language(s) Spoken by Respondents

Data in Table 8 cover responses to Items 12 and 13 of the questionnaire as to whether English or Navajo was spoken. It was disclosed that 71.7 percent spoke English and 100 percent spoke Navajo. Only 3.5 percent (the Shiprock agency) reported speaking another language (Zuñi). Within agencies, 91.8 percent of Fort Defiance respondents spoke English, 70.0 percent of Tuba City, 78.6 percent of Shiprock, 63.4 percent of Eastern Navajo, and 60.7 percent of Chinle.

It is obvious that most of the respondents were bilingual. One trilingual board member was reported at Shiprock: English, Navajo, and Zuñi. It is not known what percentage of the population sample could read and/or write English since this query was not included in the questionnaire.

Educational Level of Respondents

The data in Table 9 show the educational levels attained by board members. As compared with other studies of the educational level of board members nationwide, the percentages in the Navajo

Table 8

Language(s) Spoken by Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Language(s) Spoken at Home	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
English	63.4%	78.6%	91.8%	60.7%	70.0%	71.7%
Navajo Indian	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Other (Zuñi Indian)	-	3.5%	-	-	-	3.5%

Table 9

Educational Level of Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Educational Level	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
No formal education	(29)[a] 40.8%	(7) 25.0%	(9) 22.5%	(10) 35.7%	(11) 44.0%	(66) 34.4%
Some elementary	(25) 35.2%	(15) 53.6%	(15) 37.5%	(8) 28.6%	(13) 52.0%	(76) 39.6%
Some high school	(15) 21.1%	(5) 17.9%	(13) 32.5%	(9) 32.1%	(1) 4.0%	(43) 22.4%
Some college	(2) 2.8%	(1) 3.6%	(2) 5.0%	(1) 3.6%	(-) -	(6) 3.1%
College graduate	(-) -	(-) -	(1) 2.5%	(-) -	(-) -	(1) 0.5%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

Area were very low. Only one respondent reported a college degree, and six others reported some college. Some elementary education was reported by 76 (39.6 percent); no formal education was reported by 66 (34.4 percent); and some high school was reported by 43, representing 22.4 percent.

Within the agencies, for no formal education, Tuba City was first with 44.0 percent, and Fort Defiance was last, with 22.5 percent. For some elementary education, Shiprock had the high of 53.6 percent, and Chinle the low of 28.6 percent. Some high school education was reported by 32.5 percent from Fort Defiance, with Chinle's 32.1 percent running a close second, and Tuba City last with 4.0 percent. All agencies but Tuba City reported one or two with some college education, but only one college graduate (from Fort Defiance) was reported.

A question arises at this point concerning board member effectiveness as related to formal education. Stapley's study showed that school board effectiveness was related to formal education.[1] However, according to Reeder, "many persons who have received little formal education are well educated and make excellent board members."[2] The data obtained in this study show that well educated Navajos are barely represented on the boards.

---

[1]Maurice E. Stapley, Schoolboard Studies (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957), p. 3.

[2]Ward G. Reeder, School Boards and Superintendents (New York: Macmillan Co., 1946), p. 4.

The data show that 66 board members lacked any formal education, while only 7 had gone beyond high school. This would seem to have some important implications. Perhaps more board members with higher education would have been found among the nonrespondents. The term formal education may have misled some respondents, who might have taken the word formal to mean attainment of a high school diploma or a college degree. Also, as Reeder said, a man may lack formal education, and yet be well educated, that is, self-educated. Such a person may well class himself as "no formal education" on a questionnaire. Moreover, the effectiveness of board membership has yet to be demonstrated in relation to formal education. Presumably there is such a relationship; on the other hand, interest in children and a keen perception of pertinent matters, plus commonsense or "horse sense," may well make the difference between an effective board member and an ineffectual one, despite lack of "formal" education.

Types of Schools Attended by Respondents

Data in Table 10 pertain to the types of schools attended by respondents. A large number (105 or 54.7 percent) of those who had attended school had gone to BIA schools, as might be expected. Private or parochial schools had been attended by 14 or 7.3 percent; public (state) schools had been attended by 8 or 4.2 percent. Eastern Navajo accounted for most of those who had gone to each type of school, except the private or parochial school. Only one respondent from Eastern Navajo had gone to a private or parochial

Table 10

Types of Schools Attended by Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Type of School Attended	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Bureau of Indian Affairs	(33)[a] 46.5%	(17) 60.7%	(27) 67.5%	(14) 50.0%	(14) 56.0%	(105) 54.7%
Public (state)	(5) 7.0%	(1) 3.6%	(2) 5.0%	(-) -	(-) -	(8) 4.2%
Private or parochial	(1) 1.4%	(-) -	(10) 25.0%	(1) 3.6%	(2) 8.0%	(14) 7.3%
No responses	(32) 45.0%	(10) 35.7%	(1) 2.5%	(13) 46.4%	(9) 36.0%	(65) 33.9%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent number of respondents in each agency.

school, whereas 10 at Fort Defiance had attended such schools. That 65 respondents, representing 33.9 percent, had not answered the question, was taken to indicate that they had had no formal education. Table 9 was then examined to see if respondents listing "no formal education" corresponded to the "no responses" entry for schools attended. Table 9 showed 66 respondents or 34.4 percent without formal education. The results were then apparently consistent.

Occupations of Respondents

Data in Table 11 show the occupations of board members. Although most board members in the United States come from the economically-favored groups, within the Navajo Area quite the opposite appears true. For this study, occupations had been categorized (see Chapter 3, p. 31 for a detailed explanation of categories) as professional, skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled (labor), self-employed, tribal employee, housewife, and unemployed. According to Table 11, the self-employed category provided the largest number (57) of school board members; this also represented the largest percentage (29.7 percent) of the total. The category of tribal employee furnished 56 employees, representing 29.2 percent. The categories of professional and skilled gave only 5 and 16 members, representing 2.6 and 8.3 percent of the total, respectively. It was from these categories that the economically-favored groups might have furnished most of the school board

Table 11

Occupations of Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Type of Occupation	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Professional	1.4%	-	5.0%	-	8.0%	2.6% (5)[a]
Skilled	9.9	3.6	5.0	7.1	16.0	8.3% (16)
Semi-skilled	12.7	-	12.5	7.1	8.0	9.4% (18)
Unskilled (labor)	7.0	10.7	-	-	20.0	6.8% (13)
Self-employed	33.8	35.7	15.0	28.6	36.0	29.7% (57)
Tribal employee	21.1	7.1	35.0	64.2	28.0	29.2% (56)
Housewife	22.5	10.7	12.5	3.6	12.0	14.6% (28)
Unemployed	16.9%	42.9%	30.0%	46.4%	4.0%	26.0% (50)

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent total number of persons in that type of occupation.

members if the pattern of public school board members as to economic status had held.

Within the agencies, Eastern Navajo accounted for 33.8 percent of self-employed board members, and Shiprock accounted for 35.7 percent. However, the category of tribal employee showed a high of 64.2 percent in Chinle, and a low of 7.1 percent in Shiprock. The highest percentage for housewife was found in Eastern Navajo, the lowest in Chinle (22.5 and 3.6 percent, respectively). Unemployment was prevalent through all five agencies, with Chinle reporting the highest percentage and Tuba City the lowest (46.4 and 4.0 percent, respectively).

Length of Time Served on the Board by Respondents

Data in Table 12 show the length of time served by board members. Other studies have indicated that the length of term for school board members ranges from one year to life. In fact, three-year and over six-year terms occur almost as frequently as four-year terms. It would seem that, according to Counts:

> Term of office should be of sufficient length to give the individual member time enough to become thoroughly familiar with the task which society assigns to him . . . but should not be so long as to tempt the member to lose touch . . . and give support to policies which are out of harmony with the ideals and purposes of the community served.[3]

---

[3]George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927), p. 19.

Table 12

Length of Time Served on the Board by Respondents
(Percentage of Total)

Length of Time	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
One year or less	(26)[a] 36.6%	(11) 39.3%	(9) 22.5%	(7) 25.0%	(14) 56.0%	(67) 34.9%
Over one year	(14) 19.7%	(3) 10.7%	(13) 32.5%	(7) 25.0%	(5) 20.0%	(42) 21.9%
Three years or more	(31) 43.7%	(14) 50.0%	(18) 45.0%	(14) 50.0%	(6) 24.0%	(83) 43.2%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent the number of respondents in each agency.

The Navajo Community School Boards were established on the reservation in the latter half of 1968. Therefore, it is evident that, at the time this study was conducted, no member could claim membership of more than approximately three and one-half years. According to Table 12, 43.2 percent had served three years or more; 21.9 percent had served more than one year; and 34.9 percent had served a year or less. Thus, it is seen that slightly less than half had been with the boards since their inception. Within agencies, both Shiprock and Chinle showed that 50.0 percent of board members had served the maximum period. Tuba City board members were apparently the newcomers since 56.0 had served a year or less; this was the highest percentage from all agencies for this class.

Consideration of these data indicated that some relationship might exist between age of respondents and length of board service, educational level and length of board service, or occupation and length of board service. According to Table 4 (p. 41), Shiprock had a high of 32.1 percent in the 40-49 age group, and Chinle had a high of 35.7 in the 50-59 age group. These two age groups showed the highest percentages of the total. The implication is that a relationship of some kind did exist between age and length of board service. Apparently members between 40 and 59 years of age were either strongly motivated, possibly by number of children in the family, or were considered by the community to be very effectual. Thus, they were elected or appointed to the board

for maximum length of service. As for any relationship between level of education and length of service, Table 9 (p. 51) showed that 53.6 percent of Shiprock members had some elementary education, while Chinle showed that 35.7 percent had no formal education. In the latter instance, the lack of formally educated members may have been somewhat offset by the fact that an almost equal percentage (32.1 percent) reported some high school. Shiprock showed no such balance; the nearest percentage was 25.0 for no formal education. Examination of Table 11 (occupations of respondents) disclosed that Shiprock had 35.7 percent of self-employed (but 42.9 percent unemployed), while Chinle had 64.2 percent of tribal employed (and 46.4 percent unemployed). Thus, both agencies with members showing high percentages of length of maximum service had high percentages within the two employment categories which furnished most of the board members.

Examination of the same tables in relation to Tuba City's 56.0 percent of members with one year or less of service revealed that 56.0 percent fell in the 50-59 age group, 52.0 percent had some elementary education, and 36.0 percent were self-employed. The percentage in the age group of 50-59 was somewhat surprising; one might have expected that the newcomers would be younger. The percentages of educational level and occupational status followed the same trend established for the highest percentages of maximum service. Determination of significance of these relationships would entail different statistical procedures which were not used in this study.

Method of Selection of Respondents for School Board

Data in Table 13 relate to the method of selection for school board service. Two methods were considered: election by local chapter majority vote, and appointment by local chapter officials. The majority (162, representing 84.4 percent of the total) had been elected; thirty had been appointed, representing 15.6 percent. The implication is that the majority of the board members as electees were the "true" representatives of the community. This does not mean that the appointed members were not also "true" representatives. However, it is quite possible that candidates for election outnumbered the positions vacant. Any vacancies occurring by reason of death or resignation, if not filled by election, could have been filled by appointment of candidates who had lost in the elections. It is taken for granted that appointees were chosen for their interest in the community and educational affairs, besides on the basis of other qualifications chapter leaders might have considered necessary.

Tables 4, 9, and 11 were again examined for indications of possible relationships between age and method of selection, educational level and method of selection, and occupation and method of selection. Table 12 was also examined for connection between length of service and method of selection.

Among the agencies, Chinle had 92.9 percent of elected members, while Fort Defiance was first for appointed members with 21.4 percent. For age, Chinle had a high of 35.7 percent in the

Table 13

Method of Selection of Respondents for School Board
(Percentage of Total)

Selection Method	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Elected by majority vote at local chapter	(58)[a] 83.1%	(22) 78.6%	(33) 82.5%	(26) 92.9%	(22) 88.0%	(162) 84.4%
Appointed by local chapter officials	(12) 16.9%	(6) 21.4%	(7) 17.5%	(2) 7.1%	(3) 12.0%	(30) 15.6%

[a]Numbers enclosed in parentheses ( ) represent the number of respondents in each agency.

50-59 age group, while Fort Defiance had a high of 32.5 percent in the same age interval, but Tuba City had the highest percentage (56.0 percent) of all agencies within this group. For education, Chinle's high was 35.7 percent in the no formal education category, although this was almost balanced by the 32.1 percent with some high school education. Fort Defiance had 37.5 percent with some elementary education and 32.5 percent with some high school. Thus, it appears that Fort Defiance board members were better educated than Chinle board members. For occupation, Chinle had 64.2 percent in the tribal employee class, and Fort Defiance had 35.0 percent in the same class. For length of service, Chinle had 50.0 percent, but Fort Defiance had 45.0 percent, with three or more years of service.

Interpretation of these figures is difficult. However, the first noteworthy fact is that Chinle appears in all comparisons, with comparatively high percentages. Both elected and appointed groups (Chinle and Fort Defiance) appeared to fall into the trend noted before for age groups (50-59), education (some elementary and some high school), and occupation (tribal employee). For length of service, Chinle (electees) ranked first with Shiprock for three years of service or more, but Fort Defiance had 45.0 percent. Elected and appointed members seemed to have almost the same representation in the length of service (three years or more) category.

Respondents' Participation in School Board Training

According to data in Table 14, not all school board members had participated in the monthly school board training sessions since the establishment of the NCSB in the Navajo Area. For the past three years, Dr. Irving Stout from Arizona State University at Tempe, with Wayne Pratt as assistant, has conducted these monthly training sessions in all five agencies on the reservation. The purpose has been to instruct board members in their duties and responsibilities.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs contracted with Arizona State University to set up the Indian Board of Education and to provide the training sessions. The contract expired at the close of the 1971-72 academic year. However, it was stipulated in the School Board Manual that a training program shall be provided yearly by the Navajo School Board Association, the nature and duration of such training to be determined by the Association.[4] It is the intent of the educators in the Navajo Area to continue the training sessions. The Chief of the Branch of Educational Liaison (Navajo) in the Navajo Area will proceed with the task.

Of the 192 respondents, 166, representing 86.5 percent, reported having participated in the training sessions. The remaining 26, or 13.5 percent, had not participated. Among agencies, Shiprock had the high of 96.4 percent participants,

---

[4]Irving W. Stout, A Manual for Navajo Community School Board Members (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1969), p. 73.

Table 14

Respondents' Participation in School Board Training
(Percentage of Total)

Participation in Training	Agencies					Total
	Eastern Navajo	Shiprock	Fort Defiance	Chinle	Tuba City	
Have participated (Yes)	(57)[a] 80.3%	(27) 96.4%	(36) 90.0%	(24) 85.7%	(22) 88.0%	(166) 86.5%
Have not participated (No)	(14) 19.7%	(1) 3.6%	(4) 10.0%	(4) 14.3%	(3) 12.0%	(26) 13.5%

[a]Numbers in parentheses ( ) represent the number of respondents in each agency.

while Eastern Navajo had the lowest (80.3 percent) rate for participation. All agencies showed high percentages of participants in training sessions.

Tables 12 (p. 58) and 13 (p. 62) were examined for possible comparisons between length of board service and training participation, and method of selection of board members and training participation. Shiprock showed 50.0 percent for members who had served three years or more; Eastern Navajo showed its highest rate (43.7 percent) in the same service category. Thus, it may be inferred that length of service and participation in training sessions are positively related.

As for method of selection, Shiprock had the lowest rate (78.6 percent) among agencies for elected members, and the highest (21.4 percent) for appointed members. Eastern Navajo showed 83.1 percent of its members elected and 16.9 percent appointed, neither the highest nor the lowest in either category. Participation in training apparently bears little relation to method of selection.

The high percentages of all agencies reporting participation in training sessions apparently indicate that most board members took the sessions seriously. Reasons for nonparticipation were not explored.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to give a summary of the study, including its objectives, method of investigation, and results. Based upon the study findings, conclusions are presented, followed by recommendations for further research and practical utilization of the study.

Summary

Although the history of Navajo education extends back to the Treaty of 1868 between the Navajo Tribe and the United States government, the most progress has been made during the 1950's and 1960's. Various innovative programs have been implemented with the help of the government and colleges and universities. The overall education program has been coordinated to attack some of the basic problems of education. In 1968, the establishment of the Navajo Community School Board (NCSB) system was an important step toward self-determination and self-control of Navajo schools by the Navajo Tribe.

Purpose. The purpose of the study was twofold: (1) to identify and investigate the sociological and economic characteristics of Navajo Community School Board members; and (2) to compare Navajo School Board members with general public school

board members. Specific objectives were to: (1) identify the social composition of Navajo School Boards; (2) identify the economic status of NCSB members; (3) identify the educational status of NCBS members; (4) ascertain the total length of service on the boards by NCSB members; and (5) ascertain the method of selection of NCSB members.

The study was limited to members of the NCSB on the Navajo Reservation. One major difficulty was anticipated, that of language. Many board members do not speak, read, or write English; therefore, assistance would have to be provided in obtaining pertinent data from these members.

Method of investigation. A twenty-two item questionnaire was constructed to investigate NCSB members' sex, marital status, age, state of birth, number of children who had attended or were attending various types of schools, church preference, language(s) spoken, level of education, kinds of schools attended, occupation, years of service on the school board, method of selection, participation in NCSB training sessions.

Copies of the questionnaire with an accompanying cover letter were mailed to 320 members of the NCSB within the five areas of the Navajo Reservation. The schools representing the sample were 44 federally operated boarding schools, 10 federal day schools, 4 peripheral dormitories, and 2 Navajo-contracted schools. School principals and area superintendents were asked for support and assistance.

Questionnaires were mailed on March 13, 1972. Follow-up procedures consisted of telephone calls to superintendents, follow-up letters, and appeals in person at some of the NCSB training sessions. The cut-off date was May 18, 1972. In this manner, 192 returns were received, representing a response rate of 60 percent. Data were tabulated by numbers and percentages.

Results. A brief summary of the findings is as follows:

1. Most of the board members were males (70.3 percent).

2. Most of the board members were married (88.5 percent).

3. For age, 31.3 percent were between the ages of 50 and 59; 27.6 percent were between 40 and 49.

4. For state of birth, 51.6 percent named New Mexico; 45.8 percent named Arizona; and 2.6 percent named Utah.

5. Most (44.6 percent) of the respondents' children had attended Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

6. Ratings for church preference showed that 58.3 percent favored Protestant sects; 20.8 percent favored Roman Catholic; 22.3 percent favored the Native American Church; and 17.7 percent preferred Traditional Navajo.

7. For language(s) spoken, 100 percent spoke Navajo; 71.7 percent spoke English (to some extent).

8. In reference to educational level achieved, 39.6 percent had some elementary education; 34.4 percent had had no formal education; 22.4 percent had some high school; 3.1 percent had some college; and 0.5 percent (1 person) had achieved a college degree.

9. The majority of the respondents had attended Bureau of Indian Affairs schools (54.7 percent); 33.9 percent made no response, evidently because they had not attended school; 7.3 percent had attended private or parochial schools; and 4.2 percent had attended public (state) schools.

10. In respect to occupations, 29.7 percent were self-employed (ranchers, farmers, silversmiths, etc.); 29.2 percent were tribal employees (council delegates, federal agencies etc.); 14.6 percent were housewives; 9.4 and 8.3 percent were semi-skilled or skilled, respectively. Unemployed persons represented 26.0 percent of the total.

11. Many (43.2 percent) respondents had served on school boards for three years or more; 34.9 percent had served one year or less; and 21.9 percent had served over one year.

12. The majority (84.4 percent) of board members had been elected by chapter vote to serve on the school boards; 15.6 percent had been appointed by local chapter officials.

13. Most board members (86.5 percent) had participated in NCBS training sessions; 13.5 percent had not.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on actual study findings and information drawn from review of the literature. The first part of the study's purpose was achieved with the tabulation of questionnaire data, to present a profile of NCSB members on all possible aspects. The second part of the purpose,

to compare NCSB members with general public school board (board of education) members, is carried out in the following description:

A "typical" public school board is difficult to define, but examination of the literature revealed a national pattern.[1] A "typical" local school board will have from five to seven members who are elected on a non-partisan ballot. They will not have been "screened" by any quasi-official body, but will probably represent liberal and/or conservative political interests, broadly defined, as found in the community. The board will be composed mostly of men, about half of whom will have college background and therefore will come from the community professional and business groups. Many members will have three or four years of experience on the board, but one or two members will be new every year or so. Members will be "solid" citizens, but not particularly distinguished or powerful in the community. The board will meet formally once a month.

In comparison, most members of the NCBS system will be elected by majority of local chapter vote; some will have been appointed by local chapter officials. Presumably members will

---

[1]Representative sources include: Neal C. Gross, Schoolboard: Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley, 1958), pp. 91-98; James D. Koerner, Who Controls American Education? A Guide for Laymen (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 122; William R. Robinson, American Education: Its Organization and Control (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 48-50; Ward G. Reeder, School Boards and Superintendents: A Manual on Their Powers and Duties (New York: Macmillan Co., 1944), p 4.

represent Navajo interests in particular, rather than Democratic or Republican or other national political organizations. The NCSB's, too, will be composed mostly of men, but their educational background will differ vastly from the educational background of public school board members. Members of NCSB's will have either no formal training or some elementary schooling only. Few will have high school education, and individuals with college background are scarce indeed. NCSB members' occupations are most likely to be in the self-employed and tribal employee categories, rather than professional or business. Many members of the NCSB's will have served three or more years, but a comparison of public school board members with NCSB members on this point is unfair since no NCSB member could have served much more than three years. The NCSB system was established in late 1968; thus, the maximum period of service would be approximately three and a half years.

Other data of minor importance emerged from the study of NCSB members. Members are likely to be married, between the ages of 50 and 59, born on the Indian reservation, possessing large families, Protestant or Native American Church, bilingual (speaking Navajo and English), and participants in NCSB training sessions.

From this comparison, it was concluded the NCSB members differed in certain important aspects, such as educational level, from public school board members. Public school board members would not be expected to be bilingual or affiliated with an

Indian church, although some would probably belong to minor religious sects. Public school board members would not need training sessions in board duties, but perhaps orientation periods are held for new members.

A few additional conclusions were reached on the basis of the review of literature and the investigator's personal experiences. First, the Navajo Tribe is being encouraged to maintain its language and culture, whereas previously the Navajo language was forbidden and Navajo culture was downgraded. Second, it is evident that the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribe are actively cooperating in activities related to eventual control of community schools by the Navajo Tribe itself. Then the NCSB system will have operational powers, as well as advisory rights. Third, the Navajo Tribe may attain full autonomy sooner than originally expected. This conclusion is based on news media information that the federal government is prepared to grant the Navajo Tribe full operational control of its own affairs, including assumption of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' budget of approximately $110 million per fiscal year.[2] The actual transference of authority may require some time, but the Navajo Tribe is at last within sight of its long-sought, long-dreamed-of goal--self-determination and self-rule.

---

[2] The El Paso [Texas] Times, July 19, 1972, p. 6-C.

Recommendations

The following is a list of recommendations:

1. The present NCSB manual is inadequate to meet the existing needs of NCSB members. Roles and responsibilities should be better defined. Therefore, the manual should be revised.

2. Since Indian self-determination is being sought, efforts should be made to involve the Navajos in recognizing and seeking solutions for their own problems. This includes the education of their children. In this way, when the Navajos take over the operation of their educational systems, they will be better prepared to manage them.

3. Provisions should be made for continuous follow-up procedures in expanding educational programs and making up educational deficiencies. Such procedures might include:

a. Training sessions for board members with more emphasis on their own interests and wishes through a problem-solving (practical) approach should be implemented.

b. An intensive summer training program for board members should be provided. Its purpose would be to help develop some understanding of the differences existing between the Navajo Tribe and state governmental functions and structure of the state governments.

c. Use of audio-visual equipment, charts, and other materials to teach board members the basic principles of state and federal governments should be developed.

4. A replication of this study using behavioral and attitudinal factors should be conducted. The replication would be conducted in order to determine the status of those particular dimensions in Navajo education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Almack, John. The School Board Member. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927.

Ashby, Lloyd W. The Effective School Board Member. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968.

Ashe, Robert W. Survey Report--Navajo Community College. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1966. (ED 017 229)

Bemis, Maynard. Boardmanship: A Guide for the School Board Member. Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1955.

Berry, Brewton. The Education of the American Indian: A Survey of the Literature. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968. (ED 026 545)

Butts, R. Freeman. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Campbell, Roald F. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

Casteller, William B. Administering the School Personnel Program. New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.

Coombs, L. Madison. The Educational Disadvantage of the Indian-American Student. Las Cruces, N.M.: New Mexico State University, 1970. (ED 040 815)

Counts, George S. The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Diefendorf, John W. School Boards. Albuquerque: Division of Research, Department of Government, University of New Mexico, 1947.

Driver, Harold E. Indians of North America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Dykes, Archie R. School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relationships. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1965.

Engelking, N. F. There's an Indian in Your Classroom: A Guide for Teachers of Indian Children. Boise, Idaho: State Department of Education, July, 1968.

Fiscal Year 1970 Statistics Concerning Indian Education. Lawrence, Kansas: Publication Service, Haskell Indian Junior College, 1970. (ED 046 569)

Garber, Lee O. The Law Governing School Board Members and School Board Meetings. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

Goldhammer, Keith. The School Board. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.

Good, Carter V. Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Gross, Neal C. Schoolboard: Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley, 1958.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan Co., 1966.

Hamilton, Robert R. Legal Aspects of School Board Operation. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1958.

James, H. Thomas (ed.). Boardmanship: A Guide for the School Board Member. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Johnson, Broderick H. Navajo Education at Rough Rock. Rough Rock, Arizona: Rough Rock Demonstration School, D.I.N.E., Inc., 1968.

Johnson, Robert H. The School Board and Public Relations. New York: Exposition Press, 1964.

Kanezevich, Stephen J., Jr. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Kelly, Lawrence C. The Navajo Indians and Federal Indian Policy. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1968.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, and Dorothea L. The Navajo. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1962.

Koerner, James D. Who Controls American Education? A Guide for Laymen. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

McKinley, Francis. Who Should Control Indian Education? Berkeley, Calif.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, February, 1970.

Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration: Its Development, Principles, and Future in the United States. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1940.

Navajo Tribe Education Committee. Teaching of English to Navajo Children. Fourth Annual Conference on Navajo Education, University of New Mexico, January 22-25, 1961. Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Tribe Education Committee, 1961. (ED 021 667)

New Mexico State Department of Education. Handbook for Board of Education Members and School Administrators. Santa Fe: New Mexico Department of Education, 1957.

Pintar, George M. Role Expectations and Perceptions of School Board Members as Viewed by Referent Groups. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University, 1964.

Reeder, Ward G. School Boards and Superintendents: A Manual on Their Powers and Duties. New York: Macmillan Co., 1946.

Reeves, Charles E. School Boards: Their Status, Functions and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Robinson, William R. American Education: Its Organization and Control. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968.

Roessel, Robert A. The Right To Be Wrong and the Right To Be Right. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1968. (ED 018 382)

Roessel, Ruth. Navajo Studies at Navajo Community College. Many Farms, Arizona: College Press, 1971.

School Personnel Preparation for American Indians: Present State and Needed Steps. Las Cruces, N.M.: New Mexico State University, 1971. (SP 004 638)

Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Southwest Indian Country. A Sunset Travel Book. Menlo Park, Calif.: Lane Magazine and Book Co., 1970.

Stapley, Maurice E. Schoolboard Studies. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

Stout, Irving W. A Manual for Navajo Community School Board Members. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1969.

Strayer, George D. The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy. Washington: Educational Policies Commission, NEA and AASA, 1938.

Three Hundred Years of American Indian Oratory. The Navajo Social Studies Project. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, College of Education [n.d.].

Treaty Between the United States of America and the Navajo Tribe of Indians. Flagstaff, Arizona: K.C. Publications, 1958.

Tuttle, Edward M. School Board Leadership in America. Chicago: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

Underhill, Ruth M. The Navajos. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956.

Wall, Leon, and William Morgan. Navajo-English Dictionary. Washington: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1958. (ED 022 618)

Yazzie, Allen D. Yazzie Reports on Education Activities. Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Public Relations and Information Department, 1968. (ED 020 825)

Young, Robert W. English As a Second Language for Navajos. Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Area Office, Division of Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1967.

_____. The Navajo Yearbook. VIII. 1951-1961: A Decade of Progress. Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Agency, 1961.

_____, and William Morgan. The Trouble at Round Rock. Navajo Historical Series No. 2. [N.p.]: Division of Education, U.S. Department of the Interior, Haskell Press, 1952.

Zintz, Miles V. Education Across Cultures. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1963.

B. PERIODICALS AND NEWSPAPERS

The El Paso [Texas] Times, July 19, 1972.

Fisher, William H. "No 'Rubber Stamps' Wanted," Journal of NMSB's Association, IV, 1 (November, 1959).

Navajo Education Newsletter, September, 1970; October, 1971. Published by the Division of Education, Navajo Area, Window Rock, Arizona.

C. ENCYCLOPEDIAS AND ALMANACS

Harris, Chester W. "Current Status of Survey Research," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1960.

Reader's Digest Almanac and Yearbook 1969. Pleasantville, N.Y.: Reader's Digest Association, 1969.

Reader's Digest Almanac and Yearbook 1972. Pleasantville, N.Y.: Reader's Digest Association, 1972.

Washburn, Wilcomb E. "Indians, American," Americana Annual, 1970. Pp. 355-357.

D. MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL

Johnson, Lyndon B. The Forgotten American: Message to the Congress on Goals and Programs for the American Indian. March 6, 1968. (ED 024 500)

Kennedy, Edward M. Address by the Senator of Massachusetts Before the National Congress of American Indians, Albuquerque, New Mexico, October 7, 1969.

McKenzie, Taylor. Address Before the Twelfth Annual Conference on Navajo Education, Community Center, Shiprock, New Mexico, April 16-18, 1970.

New Horizons for Indian Education. Ninth Annual American Indian Education Conference, Arizona State University, March 22-23, 1968. Tempe: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, Arizona State University, 1968. (ED 027 981)

White, Thurman M. "A Socio-Economic Attitudinal Study of New Mexico School Board Members and School Superintendents." Unpublished Ed.S. Study, New Mexico State University, 1965.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE USED

IN THE STUDY

C
O
P
Y

New Mexico State University
Dept. of Educ. Admin.
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
March 13, 1972

Dear School Board Member:

I am a Navajo graduate student presently enrolled at New Mexico State University for the 1971-72 school year.

In completing work for an Education Specialist degree in Educational Administration, I have chosen to do a survey study of the Navajo Community School Board members on the Navajo Reservation.

The information gathered will be an important asset in providing new ideas on the many questions concerning the existing, as well as the future, problems of Navajo Education. The enthusiasm shown by the educators of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribe indicates that this data would be of vital importance in the current stages of evaluation in determining strengths and weaknesses concerning all phases of the recently organized NCSB on the reservation.

I am sure you will find the questionnaire interesting and easy to answer. Some questions may seem very personal, but I can assure you the data will be treated in a strictly confidential and professional manner.

Please fill it out completely and return it in the enclosed envelope or return it to your school principal. Your cooperation is sincerely desired in filling out this questionnaire.

The results of the study can be made available to you if you so desire.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Marjorie T. Dodge

MTD/mtd

Enclosures

QUESTIONNAIRE to the Navajo Community School Board members for the Federally operated schools on the Navajo Indian Reservation. All information will be kept strictly confidential.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. NAME:

   Mr., Mrs., Miss _____
   First Middle Maiden Last

2. Current Mailing Address:

   _____
   Box No. City State Zip Code

3. Marital Status: (Check one)

   Single _____
   Married _____
   Divorced _____
   Separated _____
   Widowed _____

4. What is your age? (Check one)

   20-29 _____
   30-39 _____
   40-49 _____
   50-59 _____
   60-69 _____
   70 or over _____

5. What state were you born in? (Check one)

   New Mexico _____
   Arizona _____
   Utah _____
   Colorado _____
   Other (please indicate) _____

6. Number of your children who attend or attended Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools?_____

7. Number of your children who attend or attended Public Schools?_____

8. Number of your children who attend or attended Private or Parochial schools?_____

9. Number of your children who attend or attended Navajo-controlled schools? (Ramah, Rough Rock or Navajo Community College) _____

10. Number of living children in your family.

Boys _____ Girls _____ None _____

11. What is your church preference? (Check one)

Baptist _____
Methodist _____
Mennonite _____
Lutheran _____
LDS _____
Episcopal _____
Presbyterian _____
Roman Catholic _____
Christian Reform _____
Church of Christ _____
Assembly of God _____
(Pentecostal)
Navajo _____
(Traditional)
Native American
Church _____
Other _____
No Religion _____

12. Do you speak English? (Check one)

Yes _____ No _____

13. Do you speak Navajo? (Check one)

Yes _____ No _____

14. What is your level of Education? (Check one)

No Formal Education _____
Some elementary _____
Some high school _____
Some college _____
College graduate _____

15. If educated, list highest degree. _____

16. If educated, what kind of schools did you attend?

Bureau of Indian Affairs school _____
Public school _____
Parochial or Mission school _____

17. What is your occupation?

_____

18. How many years have you been a member of the Navajo Community School Board?

_____ months _____ years

19. How were you selected? (Check one)

Elected by majority vote _____
Appointed _____

20. What school on the Navajo Reservation do you represent?

Name of school: _____

21. Have you participated in any of the Navajo Community School Board Training Sessions?

Yes _____ No _____

22. When this study has been completed, would you like to have a copy of the results?

Yes _____ No _____

Thank you for your fine cooperation.

Marjorie T. Dodge
Dept. of Educ. Admin.
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

APPENDIX B

MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE

1. Principals
2. Superintendents
3. Follow-up

C
O
P
Y

New Mexico State University
Dept. of Educ. Admin.
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
March 13, 1972

Dear Principal:

I am a Navajo graduate student presently enrolled at New Mexico State University for the 1971-72 school year.

In completing work for an Education Specialist degree in Educational Administration, I have chosen to do a survey study to investigate and identify the sociological and economic characteristics of the Navajo Community School Board members on the Navajo Reservation.

The obtained data will be an important asset in providing new ideas on the many questions concerning the existing as well as the future problems of Navajo Education. The enthusiasm shown by the educators of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribe indicates that these data would be of vital importance in current stages of evaluating some of the strengths and weaknesses concerning all phases of the recently organized NCSB on the reservation.

The major anticipated problem is the language difficulties in interpreting the purposes and responses of the study, as many of the NCSB do not speak or write in English.

Although you as an administrator may not be a NCSB member, you do have very close contact and relationship with many of your board members representing your school. On this assumption, I am asking for your cooperation and assistance in helping me secure the information from all of your NCSB from your school area.

Please assure the board members that the information will be kept strictly confidential. This favor is asked of you with sincere desire in making this study a success. The questionnaires should be returned at your earliest convenience.

The results of the study can be made available to you if you so desire.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

/s/
Marjorie T. Dodge

MTD/mtd

Enclosures

C
O
P
Y

New Mexico State University
Dept. of Educ. Admin.
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
March 13, 1972

Agency Superintendent
Chinle
Tuba City
Shiprock
Crownpoint (Eastern Navajo)
Fort Defiance

Dear Sir:

This is to inform you that I would like to do a Descriptive Survey to investigate and identify the sociological and economic characteristics of the Navajo Community School Board members who might eventually control the federally operated schools on the Navajo Reservation.

Since the establishment of the NCSB in 1968, there has not been a study of this nature conducted on the socioeconomic composition of a "typical" Navajo School Board.

Enclosed are the cover letters and questionnaires sent to the Principals and the board members in the Navajo area.

Because the schools in your agency are involved, your interest and support will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

/s/
Marjorie T. Dodge

MTD/mtd

Enclosures

C
O
P
Y

May 4, 1972

Dept. of Educ. Admin.
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Dear Principals and School Board Members:

This letter is being sent to all school administrators and the community school board members in the Navajo Area in reference to the study of the area-wide NCSB.

The responses of the school board members have been gratifying, but further encouragements are necessary to meet the deadline of all returns on May 18, 1972.

If your questionnaire has been lost or misplaced, another will be sent on request. Your response is requested and will add to the data received.

Your sincere efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

/s/
(Mrs.) Marjorie T. Dodge